

BRIEFING PACKET STATE RELEASE

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND (NCLB)

Adequate Yearly Progress Report
2003



*Embargoed until
November 17, 2003
Noon EST*

KENTUCKY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Gene Wilhoit, Commissioner
November 11, 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction.....	3
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).....	4
NCLB Improvement School or District.....	5
Safe Harbor.....	5
NCLB Consequences.....	5
Observations for Schools.....	7
Observations for School Districts.....	8
State Adequate Yearly Progress Summary.....	9
School Results.....	10
Table 1: Schools that did not make AYP	
Table 2: Schools that did not make AYP by school type	
Table 3: Percentage of target goals that were met by school type	
District Results.....	11
Table 4: Districts that did not make AYP	
Table 5: Districts that did not make AYP by district type	
Table 6: Target goals that were met by district type	

Introduction

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) was signed into law in January 2002. Initial discussion of the act suggested that its provisions were in many respects comparable to those upon which Kentucky's system of assessment and accountability was based. Kentucky already had goals for proficient student performance, baselines and a support system for schools in assistance. It was thought that states could use existing systems to meet the requirements of NCLB. As regulations have developed, however, and provisions of revised statute better understood, less flexibility is available than earlier thought. States now find that statutory provisions are strictly interpreted, and they must make modifications to their assessments and use the assessment data to make federal accountability decisions along with their state decisions.

On June 10, 2003, Kentucky was granted conditional approval by the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) for Kentucky's state plan for implementation of NCLB. Conditional approval required the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) to submit several proposals to address NCLB requirements. Several decisions regarding the implementation of NCLB in Kentucky are still pending with the Kentucky Board of Education (KBE). As NCLB is fully implemented in Kentucky and the details are sorted out at the policy, administrative and logistical level, complex issues will likely emerge.

Kentucky law authorizes the Kentucky Board of Education to implement final assessment and accountability policy decisions through regulations after receiving advice from several statutorily created groups: the Local Superintendents Advisory Council (LSAC); the National Technical Advisory Panel on Assessment and Accountability (NTAPAA); the School Curriculum, Assessment and Accountability Council (SCAAC); the Education Assessment and Accountability Review Subcommittee; and other stakeholders. As a result, current proposals by KDE are subject to revision before becoming final through this advisory process and final approval by KBE. We expect to complete the initial plan by December 2003.

With the passage of the Kentucky Education Reform Act of 1990, Kentucky has adopted and implemented goals that are shared with those of NCLB, including: high expectations for all students; rigorous student performance standards; multiple assessments tied to the core content measuring what students know and can do, such as applying higher order thinking skills in reading and mathematics as well as in other subject areas; school accountability; student and school performance information to parents in the form of school report cards; and a goal of proficiency in 12 years by the year 2014. Besides having already implemented CATS, Kentucky also has implemented other required provisions of NCLB, including: rewards and consequences; required school improvement plans; scholastic audits; highly skilled educators assigned to schools in assistance; student data disaggregated by subpopulation; and a unified data collection and reporting system. These are some of the many examples of how Kentucky's system of public education has been implementing many of the requirements of NCLB for the past 13 years.

The remaining challenges for Kentucky are being carefully and deliberately approached, to ensure that any changes considered are not counterproductive to the gains made to date, are well thought out, and are truly supportive of improved teaching and learning. The sections below provide more detail about how Kentucky is implementing the federal No Child Left Behind Act.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

AYP is the term used in NCLB to categorize whether a school or school district has met several federal annual accountability requirements. Three components combine to determine whether a school or school district achieves AYP:

- (1) Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) in reading and mathematics
- (2) participation rate in the annual assessment
- (3) other academic indicator

The other academic indicator differs depending on the grade level of the school. The other academic indicator for elementary and middle schools is the Accountability Index and for high schools is the graduation rate.

To make AYP in reading, a school/district and every subpopulation of sufficient size must meet the AMO for reading and have at least a 95% participation rate. In addition, the school/district as a whole must meet the requirement of the other academic indicator.

To make AYP in mathematics, a school/district and every subpopulation of sufficient size must meet the AMO for mathematics and have at least a 95% participation rate. In addition, the school/district as a whole must meet the requirement of the other academic indicator.

The term "sufficient size," when applied to population numbers, indicates that:

- at the school level, there are at least 10 students per subpopulation per grade tested
- at the school or district level, there are at least 30 students per subpopulation overall where NCLB assessments are currently administered (elementary 4/5, middle school 7/8; high school 10/11)

For schools or districts that contain elementary, middle, and high school levels, both the Accountability Index and graduation rate are used for the other academic indicator. Based on whether a school/district has made AYP in reading and in mathematics, the school or district receives a yes or no in the overall AYP category. For elementary and middle schools, meeting the requirement for the other academic indicator is defined as an:

- Accountability Index of 80 or higher OR
- Accountability Index equal to or greater than the biennial goal for the corresponding year OR
- Accountability Index that exceeds that of the prior year

NCLB improvement on graduation rate means a graduation rate that:

- is equal to or greater than the corresponding annual goal OR
- exceeds that of the prior year

The application of the Accountability Index and the graduation rate as the NCLB “other academic indicator” will be *lagged* one year. *It is important to note that if a school or district does not meet the requirement of the Accountability Index at the elementary and middle school levels and/or graduation rate at the high school level, or did not test at least 95% of all enrolled students and each subpopulation of sufficient size, the school is considered to have missed its AYP in both reading and mathematics.*

NCLB Improvement School or District

A school or district that does not make AYP for two consecutive years in the same content area, reading or mathematics, is considered a No Child Left Behind Improvement School or District. A series of consequences (called “Tiers”) is required of NCLB Improvement Schools for each subsequent year the school or district does not make overall AYP. Tier 1 of consequences begins after 2 consecutive years of not making AYP in the same content area.

Safe Harbor

A school or district that has not met the reading or mathematics AMO is considered to have met the objective in reading or mathematics if the school or district:

- a) reduces its percent of total students or subpopulation(s) (whichever group(s) did not meet the reading or mathematics AMO), scoring below proficient by 10%

AND

- b) students in the same population or subpopulation(s) meet the criteria for demonstrating improvement on the Academic Index

NOTE: When data can be collected to allow the Accountability Index and graduation rate to be disaggregated by subpopulation, item “b” above will state, “students in the same population or subpopulation(s) meet the criteria for demonstrating improvement on the accountability index at the elementary and middle school level and graduation rate at the high school level.”

NCLB Consequences

If a school fails to make AYP in the *same content area for two consecutive years*, a series of consequences are outlined in NCLB. Note that these consequences do *not* apply when a school misses AYP in reading one year (but makes math) and misses AYP in math the

next year (but makes reading). The AYP must be missed in the same content area (for whatever reason) for two consecutive years for consequences to apply.

The consequences involve the following:

- PARENT NOTIFICATION (Notification to parents in school identified for NCLB improvement)
- SCHOOL CHOICE (Parents' option to transfer students)
- Write or revise COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
- Offer SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES
- CORRECTIVE ACTION
- RESTRUCTURING

NCLB has the following five Tiers of consequences:

- **Tier 1** of Consequences (2 years not making AYP): School choice, and write or revise school improvement plan.
- **Tier 2** of Consequences (3 years not making AYP): Continue school choice, revise school plan, and offer supplemental services.
- **Tier 3** of Consequences (4 years not making AYP): Continue school choice, revise school plan, continue supplemental services and implement corrective action.
- **Tier 4** of Consequences (5 years not making AYP): Continue school choice, revise school plan, continue supplemental services, continue corrective action, and write a plan for Alternative Governance.
- **Tier 5** of Consequences (6 years not making AYP): Continue school choice, revise school plan, continue supplemental services, continue corrective action, and implement Alternative Governance.

Observations for Schools*

- 701 schools met 100% of their No Child Left Behind (NCLB) AYP goals. That's 60.1% of all schools in Kentucky.
- 72.9% of elementary schools, and 44.6% of high schools and 31.8% of middle schools met all their NCLB goals.
- Of the 465 schools (39.9%) that did not make AYP, 350 of these schools made 80% or more of their goals (168 of these schools met at least 90% or more of their goals). Overall, 1051 schools in the state (90.1%) met 80% or more of their goals.
- 214 schools (18.3% overall) did not make AYP on the Other Academic Indicator. For elementary schools, the Other Indicator is the CATS Accountability Index (202 schools did not make AYP because of this). For high schools, graduation rate is the Other Indicator (12 schools did not make AYP solely because of graduation rate).
- Of the 268 schools meeting the 10/30 criteria for African-American students in Reading, 59 schools (22.0%) did not make AYP for this student subpopulation. Of the 385 schools meeting the 10/30 criteria for students with disabilities in Reading, 206 schools (53.5%) did not make AYP for this student subpopulation.
- Of the 267 schools meeting the 10/30 criteria for African-American students in Mathematics, 76 schools (28.5%) did not make AYP for this student subpopulation. Of the 384 schools meeting the 10/30 criteria for students with disabilities in Mathematics, 139 schools (36.2%) did not make AYP for this student subpopulation.

*Observations do not include 7 schools because their AYP status is unclear until USDOE acts on Kentucky's request for transitional authority. In addition, observations do not include 6 schools in Hart County, which have Annual Measurable Objectives from multiple grade levels.

Observations for School Districts*

- 55 of 175 school districts (31.4%) met 100% of their No Child Left Behind (NCLB) AYP goals.
- Of the 120 school districts (68.6%) that did not make AYP, 95 of these districts made 80% or more of their goals (51 of these school districts met at least 90% or more of their goals). Overall, 150 of 175 school districts (85.7%) in the state met 80% or more of their goals.
- 44 school districts (25.0% overall) did not make AYP on the Other Academic Indicator. The Other Indicators is the CATS Accountability Index *and* the graduation rate (for high school grades).
- With respect to African-American students in Reading and Mathematics, 8 and 15 school districts did not make AYP for this student subpopulation, respectively. These results are of concern. With respect to students with disabilities in Reading and Mathematics, 72 and 60 of the school districts did not make AYP for this student subpopulation, respectively. These findings also represent areas of concern.

*Observations do not include 1 district because their AYP status is unclear until USDOE acts on Kentucky's request for transitional authority.



NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS SUMMARY - 2003

November 11, 2003

State

Grades: PRIMARY-12

Code: 999

Met 17 out of 25 target goals (68.0 percent)

Title I School: Yes

Made Overall AYP: No

Under the federal No Child Left Behind Act a school must make 100 percent of its target goals in order to qualify as having made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

Student Group*	Met Annual Measurable Objective		Met Participation Rate****	Other Academic Indicator**
	Reading	Mathematics	Reading/ Mathematics	
All Students	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
White (Non-Hispanic)	Yes	Yes	Yes	
African-American	NO	NO	Yes	
Hispanic	Yes	Yes	NO	
Asian	Yes	Yes	NO	
Limited English Proficiency	NO	Yes	NO	
Free/Reduced Lunch	Yes	Yes	Yes	
With Disability	NO	NO	Yes	

For other academic indicators of school progress see Commonwealth Accountability Testing Results at: <http://education.ky.gov/>

* If a student group is listed as n/a in the chart, it means there were not enough students in that group at this school to get a valid score for AYP purposes.

Each student is included in the "All Students" group.

**For elementary and middle schools, the "other academic indicator" is the overall CATS 2002 accountability index, which covers the other content areas as well as reading and math. For high schools the other academic indicator is the graduation rate. The other academic indicator for schools with middle and high school grades is both the CATS 2002 accountability index and the graduation rate.

***If a subpopulation doesn't meet its Annual Measurable Objective, it can still be in "safe harbor" and considered to have made AYP if:

- The school reduced by at least 10% the number of students in the subpopulation who are not proficient, and
- That subpopulation made progress on the "other academic indicator."

**** The state is seeking transitional authority concerning the testing of students with limited English proficiency for the Spring 2003 test administration. The federal law requires that students with limited English proficiency be assessed if enrolled in the school during testing, while Kentucky administrative regulation allows these students one year to learn English before being tested. The state's January 2003 federal application proposed that Kentucky continue its definition as it is in the best interest of the students. The U.S. Department of Education did not accept the proposal, which was not known until after the 2003 test administration. This school followed the Kentucky administrative regulations in place at the time of testing. As a result, whether the school met the participation rate for limited English proficiency students to make AYP this year is unclear until the USDOE acts on Kentucky's request for transitional authority.

School Results

Table 1: Schools that did not make AYP: 470 (40.10%)*

Student Group**	Reading AYP	Mathematics AYP	Participation Rate	Other Academic Indicator
All Students	33 (2.82%)	38 (3.24%)	4 (0.34%)	214 (18.26%)
White (Non-Hispanic)	16 (1.37%)	22 (1.88%)	1 (0.09%)	
African-American	59 (5.03%)	76 (6.48%)	0 (0.00%)	
Hispanic	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.09%)	1 (0.09%)	
Asian	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
Limited English Proficient	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.09%)	1 (0.09%)	
Free/Reduce Lunch	74 (6.31%)	109 (9.30%)	9 (0.77%)	
With Disability	206 (17.58%)	139 (11.86%)	0 (0.00%)	

Table 2: Schools that did not make AYP by school type*

	Overall AYP	Other Academic Indicator	Reading AYP	Mathematics AYP	Participation Rate
Elementary (4-5)	172 (27.09%)	119 (18.74%)	36 (5.67%)	63 (9.92%)	5 (0.79%)
Middle (7-8)	137 (68.16%)	53 (26.37%)	115 (57.21%)	74 (36.82%)	4 (1.99%)
E,M (4-8)	32 (32.32%)	18 (18.18%)	8 (8.08%)	15 (15.15%)	0 (0.00%)
High (10-12)	112 (55.45%)	12 (5.94%)	90 (44.55%)	81 (40.10%)	2 (0.99%)
M,H (7-12)	10 (47.62%)	7 (33.33%)	2 (9.52%)	5 (23.81%)	0 (0.00%)
E, M, H (4-12)	2 (25.00%)	1 (12.50%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (12.50%)	0 (0.00%)
Total	465 (39.88%)	210 (18.01%)	251 (21.53%)	239 (20.50%)	11 (0.94%)

E=Elementary School, M=Middle School, H=High School

Table 3: Target goals that were met by school type*

	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-99%	100%
Elementary (4-5)	1 (0.16%)	1 (0.16%)	0 (0.00%)	11 (1.73%)	6 (0.94%)	13 (2.05%)	73 (11.50%)	67 (10.55%)	463 (72.91%)
Middle (7-8)	1 (0.50%)	4 (1.99%)	1 (0.50%)	6 (2.99%)	10 (4.98%)	20 (9.95%)	49 (24.38%)	46 (22.89%)	64 (31.84%)
E,M (4-8)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (2.02%)	1 (1.01%)	3 (3.03%)	10 (10.10%)	16 (16.16%)	67 (67.68%)
High (10-12)	1 (0.50%)	1 (0.50%)	0 (0.00%)	6 (2.97%)	8 (3.96%)	18 (8.91%)	45 (22.28%)	33 (16.34%)	90 (44.55%)
M,H (7-12)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.76%)	5 (23.81%)	4 (19.05%)	11 (52.38%)
E, M, H (4-12)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (00.00%)	2 (25.00%)	6 (75.00%)
Total	3 (0.26%)	6 (0.51%)	1 (0.09%)	25 (2.14%)	25 (2.14%)	55 (4.72%)	182 (15.61%)	168 (14.41%)	701 (60.12%)

E=Elementary School, M=Middle School, H=High School

Note: Table 1 is based on the 1172 accountable schools. The percentages are not mutually exclusive. For example, a school could have not made AYP in both reading and math. Table 2 and 3 are based on the 1166 accountable schools and does not include 6 schools in Hart County, which have Annual Measurable Objectives from multiple grade levels.

*Tables 1-3 do not include 7 schools because their AYP status is unclear until USDOE acts on Kentucky's request for transitional authority.

**Demographic data is self-reported

School District Results

Table 4: School Districts that did not make AYP: 120 (68.18%)*

Student Group**	Reading AYP	Mathematics AYP	Participation Rate	Other Academic Indicator
All Students	4 (2.27%)	1 (0.57%)	0 (0.00%)	44 (25.00%)
White (Non-Hispanic)	2 (1.14%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
African-American	8 (4.55%)	15 (8.52%)	0 (0.00%)	
Hispanic	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	4 (2.27%)	
Asian	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (1.14%)	
Limited English Proficient	1 (0.57%)	0 (0.00%)	4 (2.27%)	
Free/Reduce Lunch	18 (10.23%)	19 (10.80%)	0 (0.00%)	
With Disability	72 (40.91%)	60 (34.09%)	0 (0.00%)	

Table 5: School Districts that did not make AYP by district type*

	Overall AYP	Other Academic Indicator	Reading AYP	Mathematics AYP	Participation Rate
E,M (4-8)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
E, M, H (4-12)	120 (70.18%)	44 (25.73%)	80 (46.78%)	71 (41.52%)	6 (3.51%)
Total	120 (68.18%)	44 (25.00%)	80 (45.45%)	71 (40.34%)	6 (3.41%)

E=Elementary School, M=Middle School, H=High School

Table 6: Target goals that were met by district type*

	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-99%	100%
E,M (4-8)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	5 (100.00%)
E, M, H (4-12)	1 (0.58%)	1 (0.58%)	6 (3.51%)	18 (10.53%)	44 (25.73%)	51 (29.82%)	50 (29.24%)
Total	1 (0.57%)	1 (0.57%)	6 (3.41%)	18 (10.23%)	44 (25.00%)	51 (28.98%)	55 (31.25%)

E=Elementary School, M=Middle School, H=High School

Note: The percentages are not mutually exclusive. For example, a district could have not made AYP in both reading and math.

*Tables 4-5 do not include 1 district because their AYP status is unclear until USDOE acts on Kentucky's request for transitional authority.

**Demographic data is self-reported